

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **29 December 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-21. Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nguyen et al (USPN 5,887,275, hereinafter “Nguyen”). Claims 5 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen and further in view of Malcolm (USPN 6,427,187, hereinafter “Malcolm”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected as being anticipated by Nguyen. The Examiner avers that Nguyen teaches “using the object identifier to retrieve an object table entry associated with the object” at FIG. 7, index 704 and 706, and in col. 10, lines 33-39. Applicant respectfully points out that the cited references teach **locating the object on disk and loading it into memory**.

In contrast, the present invention uses the object identifier to retrieve an object table entry associated with the object, which **associates a given object identifier** with a corresponding physical address if the object is in main memory and an external location if the object is not in main memory (see paragraphs [0028]-[0030] of the instant application). This is beneficial because it provides a technique for locating the object whether it is in memory or is located somewhere else—possibly on a remote system. The system of Nguyen assumes that if the object is not in main memory, it is on the disk. There is nothing within Nguyen, either explicit or implicit, which suggests using the object identifier to retrieve an object table entry associated with the object, which **associates a given object identifier** with a corresponding physical address if the object is in main memory and an external location if the object is not in main memory.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the present invention uses the object identifier to retrieve an object

table entry associated with the object, which **associates a given object identifier** with a corresponding physical address if the object is in main memory and an external location if the object is not in main memory. These amendments find support in paragraphs [0028]-[0030] of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 12-20, which depend upon claim 11, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 21 February 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com